

1963

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

Approved For Release 2004/01/16 : CIA-RDP75-00149R000500340029-2

score down the image of offering constituents more defense dollars. Claims were made by both parties as though they, the politicians, were the marketing and technical arm of the defense industry. Unfortunately, the companies made no claim to the contrary to set the record straight.

It might be as frustrating as the fires of Beelzebub for professional men of industry to have the public believe that contracts are not based on capabilities, but are a part of that trite phraseology, "the political football." The administration has done the industry a disservice by not only permitting the situation to exist, but by fostering it. Even the competent men within Government who are responsible for the proper selection of contractors have been placed in a secondary role as individuals without portfolio.

How correct. A main reason goes back to the early days of 1961. A ruling was handed down, that Senators and Congressmen should be the first informed on contract awards within their respective States. This permits the party to claim, "See what we've done for you?" Winning contractors were supposed to be informed later. It was often much later. Then, the most-kicked-of-all footballs, the socioeconomic Government contract. This kind of contract carries provisions for small business, depressed areas and equal opportunity; it was dealt with in almost every political speech. What the campaigners didn't touch on was how they like to interfere with companies and unions alike at the bargaining table.

Contract awards should be released through the contracting agency and the winning contractor simultaneously. Plant employees should be told what was bid on and why the bid was won. The same story should be passed on to the public. Dates should be fixed by the Government on the award announcement. If an award is not made on that date, there should be a public statement. We've got to get it across that neither the people nor the industry fuel the glib whirl of the political turbine.

[From U.S. News & World Report, Feb. 18, 1963]

HOW MUCH POLITICS IN CONTRACT AWARDS?

Are politics and influence entering into the award of Government defense and space contracts that now total some \$60 billion a year?

The question was raised by Republican Senator Clifford P. Case, of New Jersey, in a speech on February 7.

Contracts supposedly are awarded on the basis of merit, Senator Case said, "but recent actions and statements in high official circles, indeed in the highest, raise some doubts about whether what actually goes on conforms with official policy."

Senator Case specifically questioned recent decisions involving Massachusetts, the home State of the Kennedys, and Texas, the home State of Vice President Lyndon Johnson.

THE BOSTON CASE

The Senator urged very close scrutiny of an administration proposal to establish a \$50 million basic electronic-research center in the greater Boston area. As a member of the Senate Space Committee, Mr. Case said he would insist on the fullest possible airing of the need for this facility.

THE DALLAS CASE

In Texas, according to Senator Case, Dallas—which has a Republican Congressman—fares worse than Democratic Houston in its dealings with the Government. "In Dallas," he said, "the newspapers are complaining that a \$20 million Federal Center, approved by the General Services Administration and the House and Senate Public Works Committees, has been put in deep

freeze by the administration for as long as its Republican Congressman is in office."

THE HOUSTON CASE

In Houston, which already has a multi-million-dollar Manned Space Center, "there has been continuing good news," Senator Case said. One recent plum awarded Houston: the \$43.6 million contract for the Mohole project to drill a hole in the bottom of the sea. A Houston firm got this contract, the Senator said, "despite the fact that one National Science Foundation panel rated this firm third best in a field of three, and another NSF panel rated four firms as better qualified."

THE REMEDY

The Senator's remedy for the situation is to open up to public inspection all communications—including those from Members of Congress or the executive branch—on defense or space contracts.

[From U.S. News & World Report, Mar. 11, 1963]

Officials of companies with defense and space contracts say it is no secret in the trade that the White House plays an increasingly active role in awarding contracts. Some companies have concluded that they must convince defense officials that they can fulfill the contract, and then pass a White House screening for political acceptability.

OUTDOOR RECREATION

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 20) to promote the coordination and development of effective Federal and State programs relating to outdoor recreation, and for other purposes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I have discussed the Outdoor Recreation Act of 1963, Senate bill 20, with the majority leader, the minority leader, the distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], and other Senators. It appears to be the consensus that we would be well advised to take our final vote on the bill on the coming Monday, with the understanding, of course, that the Senate will be in session tomorrow, so that further debate can be had on the outdoor recreation bill, as well as on other items.

Therefore, Mr. President, after appropriate consultation, I ask unanimous consent that, under the usual form of such requests, the Senate vote at 4 p.m. on Monday next; and that, following conclusion of the morning hour, the time be divided equally between the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the proponent of the bill, and the distinguished minority leader.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator wish to waive the requirement under rule XII for a quorum call?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes, I ask unanimous consent that the requirement be waived.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Minnesota? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Is there objection to the unanimous-consent agreement? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The unanimous-consent agreement was subsequently reduced to writing, as follows:

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Ordered: That, effective on March 11, 1963, at the conclusion of morning business, further debate on bill (S. 20) relating to the coordination and development of effective Federal and State programs relating to outdoor recreation, and for other purposes) or any amendments, motions, or appeals relative thereto (except motion to lay on the table) shall be equally divided and controlled by the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] and the majority leader [Mr. HUMPHREY]. Provided, that an amendment that is not germane to the provisions of the said bill shall be considered. Provided further, that the Senate proceed to vote on the final passage of the bill at 4 o'clock p.m.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

A NUCLEAR TEST BAN AND NATIONAL SECURITY

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I wish to address myself to the subject of the nuclear test ban and our national security.

Disarmament in general, and the current effort to achieve a nuclear test ban in particular, are a vital part of our total national effort to gain both security and peace. Far from being an abstract ideal or a purely humanitarian dream, the program of the United States for controlled disarmament, starting with a treaty to ban the testing of nuclear weapons under adequate safeguards, is solidly rooted in our vital national interests.

In defining disarmament and a nuclear weapons test ban treaty as a vital national interest, it is essential to be clear on the limitations as well as the possibilities of limitations on armaments. In the first place, arms control is only one of the essential means by which we seek to bolster our national security while maintaining the peace. Equally important in terms of their contribution to peace and security are such programs as our military and economic assistance to the less developed free nations, our new trade policy under the trade act adopted by the Congress last year, and, above all, our continuing efforts to expand military, political, and economic cooperation in the NATO alliance and other alliances. I point to these in order to stress the point that a test ban treaty is not a panacea but rather one vital element in an overall national strategy for security and peace.

It is equally important to recognize that the arms race is both the cause and reflection of a world struggle for power. It follows that a test ban treaty cannot be expected to resolve existing international tensions but it might certainly ameliorate them to a significant degree. In the words of Prof. Hans Morgenthau, eminent scholar in the field of international relations: